



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,301	03/29/2004	Peter D. Mueller	MP1437 (130196)	1819
25944 7590 04/25/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
BENZON, GREG C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2144				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/812,301

Applicant(s)

MUELLER, PETER D.

Examiner

GREG BENZON

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1- 30 are pending.

Making Final

Applicant's arguments filed 02/04/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The claim amendments regarding -- 'a communication link, local to a microprocessor subsystem.' -- and -- 'the microprocessor subsystem comprising a processor core and at least one processor subsystem, and a microprocessor bus system, the microprocessor bus system providing a communication path between the processor core and the at least one processor subsystem' -- do not overcome the disclosure by the prior art as applied in the prior Office Action, as shown below.

The Examiner is maintaining the rejection(s) using the same grounds for rejection and thus making this action FINAL.

Priority

The effective date of the claims described in this application is March 29, 2004.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Applicant is respectfully reminded that each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56.

There were no information disclosure statements filed with this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 14-18, 28-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan (US Patent 6446192) in view of Bishop (US Patent 4914653), or alternatively, Bishop in view of Narasimhan.

Narasimhan disclosed (re. Claim 1) a management port for a wireless device platform, comprising: a communication link (Narasimhan-Figure 7 , Column 6 Lines 30-

35, 'network interface chip') for the wireless device platform, (Narasimhan-Column 3 Lines 15-20) the communication link to provide an inbound link and an outbound link, (Narasimhan-Column 13 Lines 40-50) and to control data flow over the inbound and outbound links; and a management block to receive command data (Narasimhan-Figure 7, 'command processor') through a channel in the inbound link and generate a corresponding command signal on a microprocessor bus system (Narasimhan-Figure 9, Column 13 Lines 55-65, Column 14 Lines 30-35) that is local to the command link to perform a management function for the microprocessor system, (Narasimhan- Column 14 Lines 30-35, 'microcontroller') the management block being further adapted to receive a response signal from the bus and transmit corresponding response data through a channel in the outbound link. (Narasimhan-Column 13 Lines 40-50)

Narasimhan disclosed (re. Claim 1) *a communication link, local to a microprocessor subsystem*, (Narasimhan-Figure 2, Column 14 Lines 30-35, 'the internal data bus of the NIC connects directly to the device data bus').

Narasimhan disclosed (re. Claim 1) the microprocessor subsystem comprising a processor core and at least one processor subsystem, and a microprocessor bus system, (Narasimhan-Figure 9, Column 13 Lines 55-65, Column 14 Lines 30-35) the microprocessor bus system providing a communication path between the processor core and the at least one processor subsystem. (Narasimhan-Figure 9)

While Narasimhan substantially disclosed the claimed invention Narasimhan did not disclose (re. Claim 1) inter-processor communication and using logic channels.

Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 1) inter-processor communication and using logic channels. (Bishop-Column 6 Lines 55-65)

Narasimhan and Bishop are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding interfaces for multi-processor systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious in the networking art to combine Bishop into Narasimhan. The motivation for said combination would have been to minimize latency (Bishop-Column 2 Lines 15-20).

Claims 8,15,28 are rejected on the same basis as Claim 1.

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 2,17,29) wherein the communication link includes a physical layer to provide both the inbound and outbound links (Narasimhan-Column 13 Lines 40-50) with multiple logic channels, (Bishop-Column 6 Lines 55-65) and a data link protocol to control data flow over the inbound and output links. (Narasimhan-Column 13 Lines 40-50)

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 3,9) wherein the management function includes a debug function. (Narasimhan-Column 1 Lines 20-25,Column 14 Lines 60-65,'*STATUS registers provide information about errors*')

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 4,10) wherein the management function includes accessing memory. (Narasimhan-Column 17 Lines 45-55, '*the variable is identified and the device processor writes the value to the network interface chip*')

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 5,11) wherein the management function includes accessing configuration registers. (Narasimhan-Column 16 Lines 55-65)

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 6) wherein the management function includes accessing a peripheral device of the microprocessor system. (Narasimhan-Column 14 Lines 20-25,'*other device peripherals*')

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 7,16,30) wherein the management block includes: a command register connected to the bus and to the communication link, (Narasimhan-Column 14 Lines 60-65, '*commands are written to the WRITE DATA register*') the command register to temporarily store the command data delivered through the predetermined logic channel in the inbound link; a response register connected to the bus and to the communication link, the response register to temporarily store response data from the bus; (Narasimhan-Column 14 Lines 60-65, '*received data are read from the READ data register*') and a manageability controller connected to the microprocessor bus, the command register, and the response register, the manageability controller (Narasimhan-Column 6 Lines 30-40) being adapted to determine when command data is received at the command register and to transmit the corresponding command signal over the bus, and further being adapted to receive the response signal from the bus and store corresponding response data at the response register, and to transmit the response data through the predetermined logic channel in the outbound link.(Narasimhan-Figure 7,Column 13 Lines 40-50)

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 14) the management block being adapted to generate the corresponding command signal on the at least one bus to perform a management function for the at least one peripheral device. (Narasimhan-Column 6 Lines 30-40)

Narasimhan-Bishop disclosed (re. Claim 18) wherein the embedded communications microprocessor system is adapted to wirelessly communicate with at least one other devices. (Narasimhan-Column 3 Lines 15-20)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12,13, 19-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhan (US Patent 6446192) in view of Bishop (US Patent 4914653) further in view of Balachandran (US Publication 20050078620).

While Narasimhan-Bishop substantially disclosed the claimed invention Narasimhan-Bishop did not disclose (re. Claim 19) a substantially omni-directional antenna connected to the embedded communications microprocessor system; (re. Claim 12) wherein the at least one processor subsystem includes a security module;

(re. Claim 13) wherein the at least one processor subsystem includes a Universal Serial Bus (USB) client

Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 19) a substantially omni-directional antenna connected to the embedded communications microprocessor system. (Balachandran-Paragraph 8 Figure 1)

Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 12) wherein the at least one processor subsystem includes a security module (Balachandran-Paragraph 50)

Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 13) wherein the at least one processor subsystem includes a Universal Serial Bus (USB) client. (Balachandran-Paragraph 33, Figure 4)

Narasimhan,Bishop and Balachandran are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding interfaces for multi-processor systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious in the networking art to combine Balachandran into Narasimhan-Bishop. The motivation for said combination would have been to enable separation of the access functionality and the application functionality as implemented in two separate processors. (Balachandran-Paragraph 32)

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 20) wherein the communications link includes, a multi-channel inbound link and a multi-channel outbound link, the communications link being adapted to control data flow over the

inbound and outbound links; and

the manageability port is adapted to receive command data through a predetermined logic channel in the inbound link and generate a corresponding command signal on the microprocessor bus, and further is adapted to receive a response signal from the bus and transmit corresponding response data through a predetermined logic channel in the outbound link. (see rejection for Claim 7)

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 21) wherein the embedded communications microprocessor system includes a microprocessor system adapted to wirelessly communicate with at least one other device. (Narasimhan-Column 3 Lines 15-20)

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 22) wherein the microprocessor system is adapted to wirelessly communicate with at least one other devices using IEEE 802.11 technology. (Balachandran-Paragraph 33, Figure 4)

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 23) wherein the microprocessor system is adapted to wirelessly communicate with at least one other device using cellular radio technology. (Balachandran-Paragraph 33, Figure 4)

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 24) wherein the

microprocessor is adapted to wirelessly communicate using general packet radio service (GPRS) technology. (Balachandran-Paragraph 33, Figure 4)

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 25) wherein the microprocessor is adapted to wirelessly communicate using code division multiple access (CDMA) technology. (Balachandran-Paragraph 35, '*standard wireless technologies*')

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 26) wherein the microprocessor is adapted to wirelessly communicate using wideband code division multiple access (WCDMA) technology. (Balachandran-Paragraph 35, '*standard wireless technologies*')

Narasimhan-Bishop-Balachandran disclosed (re. Claim 27) a microprocessor system adapted to wirelessly communicate with at least one other devices using an IEEE 802.11 technology; and a microprocessor system adapted to wirelessly communicate with at least one other device using cellular radio technology. (Balachandran-Paragraph 33, Figure 4)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/04/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [in italics]:

[In Narasimhan] the NIC appears to the processor as simply another slave peripheral device.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Narasimhan Column 17 Lines 40-65 disclosed an embodiment wherein the NIC functions as a control relay in order to control the peripheral devices and thus is not a slave peripheral device.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [in italics]:

... the processor communicates to the NIC over a system bus through the processor's communication port using the appropriate protocol for the system inter-processor bus and does not communicate directly over the micropocessor bus system that provides a communication path between the processor core and at least one processor subsystem

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Narasimhan Figure 2, Column 14 Lines 30-35 disclosed wherein *'the internal data bus of the NIC connects directly to the device data bus'*. Where the NIC is able to control the peripheral devices in monitoring and control mode (Narasimhan Column 17 Lines 40-65) and provide several local device interfaces (Column 16 Lines 5-25) the Examiner thus concludes that *Narasimhan communicates directly over the micropocessor bus system that provides a communication path between the processor core and at least one processor subsystem.*

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure

relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Bengzon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571)272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Greg Bengzon
Patent Examiner, AU 2144

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144